

S/N 10/678,361
Response to Office Action mailed December 13, 2004

REMARKS

In response to the communication regarding the reply filed on April 8, 2005 not being fully responsive to the Office Action mailed on December 13, 2004, favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the Amendment filed on April 8, 2005, the above amendments, and the following remarks. Claim 16 is hereby amended. The amendment of claim 16 is supported by page 18, lincs. 10-26. The following comments address the rejections not addressed in the previous Amendment.

Claims 16 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tsukamoto (US 6,525,625), in view of Nishijima (US 6,304,158), and further in view of Tada (US 5,986,521). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 16 requires a "duplexer comprising a laminate in which at least four dielectric layers and at least two electrode layers are laminated alternately". The combination of Tsukamoto, Nishijima, and Tada does not teach the claimed multi-layered laminate.

Claims 1-3 were rejected as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Tsukamoto. The combination of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Figure 24) and Tsukamoto does not suggest a duplexer comprising a laminate in which at least four dielectric layers and at least two electrode layers are laminated alternately, including a matching circuit comprising a coupling line formed in a planar shape on one plane of a laminated layer, as required by claim 1. Figure 24 does not teach a coupling line formed on one plane, but rather uses capacitive electrodes 50p and 60p which are connected to the tip portion of a transmission line 70p via a through-hole to form static capacitors. The coupling line formed on one plane, as required by claim 1, alleviates unnecessary mismatching loss. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-3 is requested.

Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Figure 24), in view of Tsukamoto, and further in view of Nakakubo (US 6,140,891). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 4 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Nakakubo does not remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's

S/N 10/678,361
Response to Office Action mailed December 13, 2004

Admitted Prior Art and Tsukamoto, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration of claim 4 is requested.

Claim 16, 18, and 19 were rejected for being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Figure 24) in view of Tada. Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 16 requires a "duplexer comprising a laminate in which at least four dielectric layers and at least two electrode layers are laminated alternately". The combination of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tada does not teach the claimed multi-layered laminate.

Claim 20 was rejected for being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Figure 24), in view of Tada, and further in view of Nakakubo. Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 20 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16, from which it depends. Nakakubo does not remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Tada, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration of claim 20 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Respectfully Submitted,


Douglas P. Mueller
 Reg. No.: 30,300
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800

Dated: June 22, 2005



DPM:mfe